UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes, *Editor in Chief*

Associate Editors

Francis Neilson Louis L. Mann Curtis W. Reese

What Do Americans Believe?

By JAMES WALDO FAWCETT
JOSEPH ERNEST McAFEE

The Story of My Experiments with Truth

Part II. Chapter XVI. By M. K. GANDHI

The Outlawry of War

By S. O. LEVINSON
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
FREDERICK LYNCH
STEPHEN S. WISE
RAYMOND ROBINS

VOLUME XCVIII NUMBER 18

Chicago, January 3, 1927

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

(Established 1878)

A JOURNAL *of the* RELIGION *of* DEMOCRACY

Subscription, $3.00 per Annum

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, EDITOR IN CHIEF

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

FRANCIS NEILSON LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

UNITY Fellowship

FRANK C. DOAN
CHARLES F. DOLE
ZONA GALE
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
H. R. MUSSEY
FRANCIS NEILSON
EDMUND H. REEMAN
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Managing Editor
EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE Pamphlet Mission FOR FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER IN RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:
ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JENETH LA. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCIS L. ROGERS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, - Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., - } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

W. Waldemar W. Argow
Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Percy M. Dawson
James Waldo Fawcett
David Starr Jordan
George Saranton
Anna Garlin Spencer
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—Charles Strong
AUSTRIA—Stefan Zweig
BULGARIA—F. M. Matthéeff
CANADA—Sidney Snow
CHINA—Gilbert Reid
ENGLAND—Fred Hankinson
Walter Walsh
FRANCE—G. Demartial
Romain Rolland
GERMANY—Theodor Hahn
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
ITALY—Guglielmo Lusidi
JAPAN—Nobuichiro Imaoha
RUSSIA—Alina Huebach

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

Announcement

Part II

OF GANDHI'S AUTOBIOGRAPHY

began in this magazine on

September 20th

GANDHI'S RETURN TO INDIA
HIS LAW PRACTISE
BEGINNING OF HIS PUBLIC CAREER
and
THE GREAT STORY OF SOUTH AFRICA

Subscribe Now! *Renew Now!*

UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY
700 Oakwood Boulevard
Chicago, Illinois

Dear Sirs: Enclosed please find $3.00, for which
(a) Enter my subscription for one year from date, or
(b) Renew my subscription for one year from date of expiration.

Name .....

Address .....

Contents

EDITORIAL — Page
Notes 275
What Do Americans Believe?—JAMES WALDO FAWCETT and JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE..... 277
Jottings.—J. H. H..... 279
Editorial Correspondence: American Notes—SYDNEY STRONG 280
ARTICLES—
The Story of My Experiments with Truth—Part II, Chapter XVI—Man Proposes, God Disposes—M. K. GANDHI..... 281
The Outlawry of War:—
I. A Treaty to Outlaw War—*S. O. Levinson* 282
II. The Simplicity of Outlawry—*John Haynes Holmes*..... 283
III. Suppose America Should Lead!—*Frederick Lynch* 284
IV. Are We In Earnest?—*Stephen S. Wise.* 285
V. The Next Step—*Raymond Robins*..... 285
POETRY—
The Man of Nazareth—MARGUERITE EMILIO.. 275
THE STUDY TABLE—
Religious Dramas—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.... 285
CORRESPONDENCE—
In Reply to Mr. Dole—JOHN M. WORK..... 286
United States and Belgium—WILLIAM C. ALLEN 286
One Final Answer to Mr. Foster—WILLIAM FLOYD 286
Two Comments—VAUGHN BACHMAN BROKAW 286
From Friends Abroad: I. L. M. ENGLAND, II. HARRISON BROWN..... 287
THE FIELD—
Resolution Toward the Outlawry of War.... 287
Announcement re Dr. Sydney Strong..... 287
Kiel University Establishes Chair of Peace... 288

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOLUME XCVIII | MONDAY, JANUARY 3, 1927 | NUMBER 18

THE MAN OF NAZARETH

O friendly Man of Nazareth
To you the children came,
The old and sick, the rich and poor,
The women bowed with shame.
From out the fulness of your heart,
With wisdom from above,
You spoke the understanding word,
And blessed them with your love.

O joyous Man of Nazareth
You loved this splendid world,
Oft on the hillside, by the lake,
You saw morn's flag unfurled.
You felt each beauty of the day,
And then at its surcease,
The silence of the star-hung night
Shed on your soul deep peace.

O faithful Man of Nazareth
Your perfect trust in God
Made you to see the brighter end,
Though dark the path you trod;
As in that last and bitter hour,
When none stood by to aid,
You faced the ugliness and pain,
Calm, loving, unafraid.

For UNITY. MARGUERITE EMILIO.

We announce herewith the important and exciting news that our editorial colleague, Dr. Sydney Strong, is going to Mexico. Indeed, he will be in Mexico City by the time this note is printed. He promises to send us regular correspondence telling of what he sees and learns. We count it a particularly happy stroke of good fortune that we are to have our own editorial representative in Mexico at just this time when relations between that country and this country are so critical. We may trust Dr. Strong's reports to be both accurate and sympathetic.

The distinguished dead of 1926 present almost as long and varied a list as the distinguished dead recorded in these columns for 1925. Pre-eminent among them all are two Americans—CHARLES WILLIAM ELIOT and EUGENE VICTOR DEBS. Were there ever two such different men? The one an aristocrat, the other a plebeian—the one a product of rarest culture, the other a scion of the unwashed common people—the one all intellect and austerity, the other all emotion and expansive camaraderie—yet both, men of unblemished character, stern devotion, utter consecration, and true and triumphant leaders, in their respective fields, of the American democracy in which together they believed! Other names come rushing upon us. Among statesmen and politicians, here in America, are OSCAR STRAUS, BENJAMIN B. ODELL, ex-Governor of New York, ALTON B. PARKER, distinguished jurist and one time candidate for the presidency, Secretary of War JOHN W. WEEKS, Senator ALBERT B. CUMMINS, of Iowa, ex-Senator PETTIGREW, of Idaho, "JOE" CANNON, ex-Speaker of the House, Justice JOSEPH MCKENNA, late of the Supreme Court, Senator MCKINLEY, of Illinois, MEYER LONDON, beloved Socialist Congressman from New York, and ROBERT T. LINCOLN, son of his father, diplomat and cabinet minister. Statesmen dead during the year in foreign parts include Premier KATO, of Japan, VLADIMIR SOUKHOMLINOFF, Russian war minister in the fateful years 1914-1915, and LEONID KRASSIN, the great diplomat of Soviet Russia. Authors who have passed away are W. L. GEORGE, the English novelist, SIR SIDNEY LEE, biographer of Shakespeare and Edward VII, ISRAEL ZANGWILL, novelist, dramatist and poet, ALLEN UPWARD, author of "The New Word," ELLEN KEY, one of the greatest of modern women, and, among Americans, STUART SHERMAN, critic, CLEVELAND MOFFETT, journalist and novelist, and GEORGE STERLING, the poet. With these should be named CLEMENT SHORTER, the distinguished English journalist, and the two famous book publishers, HENRY HOLT, of America, and J. M. DENT, of England, the ever-memorable creator of the Everyman's Library.

The world of scholarship suffered serious losses during 1926, as witness KAUFMANN KOHLER, of the Hebrew Union Seminary, Cincinnati, WILLIAM BATESON, the English biologist, RUDOLF EUCKEN, the German philosopher, PAUL KAMMERER, the Austrian

biologist, who stirred afresh the great controversy over "inheritance of acquired characteristics," LUTHER BURBANK, whose achievements in the field of botany made his name a household word, and, in the allied field of higher education, WILLIAM JEWETT TUCKER, late President of Dartmouth. The church mourned the great Cardinal MERCIER, of Belgium, DAVID JAMES BURRELL, Fundamentalist of long service in New York City, W. D. P. BLISS, Episcopalian, and a pioneer in the field of social religion, NEWTON MANN, scholar as well as peacher and pastor, and EDWARD CUMMINGS and PAUL REVERE FROTHINGHAM, two of the best known Unitarians of Boston. The theatre counts among its dead the well-known actors HENRY MILLER and JAMES K. HACKETT, JULIAN MITCHELL, manager and producer, and RUDOLPH VALENTINO, "movie" star, whose death caused a greater stir than that of any other one man who passed away during the year. To these is to be added the name of A. B. WALKLEY, for many years dramatic critic on the London *Times*. In the analogous field of music, we find the names of FRANZ KNEISEL and LOUIS SVECENSKI, long associated in the great Kneisel Quartet, and HENRY T. FINCK, musical critic for more than a generation on the New York *Evening Post*. In the world of art, appear the lustrous names of JOSEPH PENNELL, of this country, and CLAUDE MONET, of France. Among reformers and philanthropists, CLEVELAND H. DODGE and THOMAS MOTT OSBORNE are to be particularly and gratefully remembered. Lastly come such unclassifiable names as Queen MARGHERITA, of Italy, EMILE COUE, WASHINGTON A. ROEBLING, builder of the Brooklyn Bridge, HOUDINI, the magician, ANNIE OAKLEY, crack rifle-shot, and CARL AKELEY, hunter and explorer. *Requiescat in pace!*

We print this week in "The Field" a copy of Senator Borah's "Resolution Toward the Outlawry of War," which was introduced into the United States Senate on December 9th last. This is the third time that this resolution has been placed before the upper house of Congress since the Senator introduced his original Outlawry resolution in February, 1923. During this period the Senate has shown little inclination to consider the august and sweeping program of peace therein laid down. But during this same period, as the *Christian Century* has recently declared, the fact that a resolution of this character has been lying on the Senate table has "exerted a silent but continuous stimulus upon public opinion to consider what this proposal means." To one who has known the Outlawry of War program from the beginning, as UNITY has, it is nothing short of amazing to consider the progress which this new and revolutionary idea has achieved in so short a space of time. Marking a reversal of all hitherto known ideas and methods of peace reform, calling for an utter change of mind in the whole understanding of the problem, challenging a complete assent to the repudiation of war, or nothing, the Outlawry program has made its way to all parts of the nation, crossed the seas to foreign lands, and now holds the support of millions of the most intelligent men and women throughout the world. Already it has remade the whole character of the constructive work for peace, and, to the mind of the discerning observer, has become the prophecy of how, in this our time, mankind is going to get rid of war. We ask our readers to study carefully Senator Borah's resolution. We ask them to keep it, as well, as an historic document, for we dare to affirm, out of our abundant faith, that historians for centuries to come will look back to this simple statement as marking a new epoch in the history of humanity. What Hugo Grotius did to control war, Mr. Borah is now doing to destroy war.

The acquittal of Doheny and Fall was disheartening, yet not wholly unexpected. The long delay in bringing the indicted men to trial had left the evidence cold and therefore ineffective; and the public mind, long distracted by other interests, gave no such support to the prosecution as to insure conviction. There is a psychology about these things! Let years pass, as in this case, and still more conspicuously in the Hall-Mills murder case, and that atmosphere in which justice can best flourish is gone. If the verdict itself, however, was disappointing—so disappointing as to constitute under other circumstances a break-down of our jury system—the public reception of this verdict was one of the most heartening things that we have seen in years. Newspapers in all parts of the country, of all shades of opinion and spirit, denounced the outcome, and condemned the defendants as morally if not legally convicted of the charge against them. The public generally, unstirred by the trial itself, was shocked into indignant protest when Doheny and Fall were released, and understood perhaps for the first time the real enormity of what was done in the free-and-easy days of Harding. The outburst in the Senate, wild and unseemly as it was, reflected accurately the repressed emotions of the country at large. Doheny undoubtedly spent happy holidays with his family; Fall smiled his ugly smile, and footed up his bank balances again. But let not these men deceive themselves. What the law and their own consciences (if they have any) cannot do, the moral sense of the nation has long since done, and now has done again. So long as they shall live, their foreheads will bear the mark of the condemnation of mankind. Wherever they may walk, they will move as men apart, pariahs among their fellows. Deeper than any crime is sin; greater than any offenses against the laws of men are offenses against the will of God. Were we these men, we should find a prison-cell a

welcome refuge—at once a hiding-place and a shrine of penitence.

Because other parties to the recent naval limitations treaties are reputed secretly to be evading the spirit of those pacts, it is proposed that the United States shall deliberately violate it. We are to build ten new cruisers, powerful and swift to the limit allowed by the letter of the agreement. By this gesture we are to announce to the other nations that we will stand no monkey-business. They must be good or they will be shot by our big guns. Or if they do not want to be shot, they will come running to a new limitation-of-armaments conference which we or somebody else must call very shortly. This is bold. Many will believe it to be great stuff. But it is only more of the same. It is war to end war. Which has been rather sufficiently tried! It is not of record that war is ended thus. Furthermore, we have not been appointed policeman to the world. Because we are the richest nation on earth, and are growing richer, because we can certainly beat them all at building cruisers if they insist on making that the game, because our former limitation-of-armaments conference did not turn out the glittering success which the stage was set to make of it, because of these and other considerations which may be thrust forward, it still does not appear that we are justified in a contest with the world in the building of war-ships. Retaliation has not demonstrated its efficiency as a method of getting things done. The abstract ethics of the program may be for the moment left out of reckoning. The method is not good sense. As a gesture it is a poor bluff. As a program of definitive action it is blundering. It will not accomplish its purpose with the opposing "powers," nor can any administration in the United States persist in it and remain in power. The plan is reported to have been conceived by the lamest of the lame ducks in the dying Sixty-ninth Senate, and it was hastily approved by a chief executive who has gained his prestige in large part from a persistent insistence upon arms reduction. It is a weak shift.

The *Outlook* beat him to it. A spicy correspondence comes to light, conducted recently between Mr. Fred B. Smith, and Mr. Ernest Abbott, editor of the *Outlook*. The *Outlook* is the only one of the general weeklies which has consistently supported the Prohibition law. Mr. Fred B. Smith thought he discovered a breach in its consistency. Don Seitz is a member of the *Outlook* staff, and is not an ardent Prohibitionist. In Mr. Smith's home town, and, indeed, in Mr. Smith's home church, Mr. Seitz was the speaker at a public meeting. In response to a question, following his address, he criticized our present Prohibition legislation, and advocated its abandonment. In resentment, Mr. Smith was for stopping the *Outlook* from entering his home. He wrote the editor a letter embodying this threat, and demanding that the *Outlook* declare its policy unequivocally. This Mr. Abbott did in an answering letter, calling attention to the fact that such a declaration was unnecessary in view of the *Outlook's* outspoken utterances. Of this no regular reader can fail to be aware. Mr. Smith, however, was not satisfied, but renewed his threat of withdrawal and of giving publicity to his withdrawal. Mr. Smith is not disinclined to the dramatic. He seems to have assumed that his threat would bring Mr. Abbott to time. It did. He acted very promptly. He returned Mr. Smith's subscription, and published the correspondence. His publicity surpasses anything which Mr. Smith might have devised. So Mr. Smith will henceforth read his neighbor's copy of the *Outlook* when he wants "news" which he has treasured these many years past as a "regular subscriber." Mr. Abbott makes it clear that the issue had become freedom of speech. He does not like his associate's personal attitude toward Prohibition, and will not permit him to control or modify the *Outlook's* attitude on that subject. But, he protests, the issue of free speech is even more important than Prohibition. That sanctity he does not consent to have Mr. Smith violate, much as Mr. Abbott approves Mr. Smith's Prohibition sentiments. Good for Mr. Abbott!

What Do Americans Believe?

[Comments on the Newspaper Religious Questionnaire.]

I

The New York *World*, in imitation of the London *Daily News* and using the psychological moment of the Christmas season, submitted to its readers, in association with other newspapers throughout the country, the twelve questions reproduced below:

Religious Belief Questionnaire

QUESTIONS—Answer ("YES" or "NO")

1. Do you believe in God?
2. Do you believe in immortality?
3. Do you believe in prayer as a means of personal relationship with God?
4. Do you believe that Jesus was divine as no other man was divine? (This question asked of Catholics and Protestants only.)
5. Do you regard the Bible as inspired in a sense that no other literature could be said to be inspired?
6. Are you an active member of any church?
7. Do you regularly attend any religious services?
8. Would you be willing to have your family grow up in a community in which there is no church?
9. Do you regularly have "family worship" in your home?
10. Were you brought up in a religious home?
11. Do you send your children to any school of religious instruction?
12. Do you think that Religion in some form is a necessary element of life for the individual and for the community?

Study of the phrasing of these questions justifies

the charge that they were designed to catch the unwary liberal. For example, "Do you believe in God?" The liberal must answer "Yes" or "No;" there is no provision for the natural question: "Which God?" If I were asked, "Do you believe in Jehovah?" I should answer in the negative; if I were asked, "Do you believe in the power of good in the universe, sometimes called 'God'?" I should answer in the affirmative. Which definition of God was in the mind of the author of this set of queries? The God of superstition, the wrathful, jealous God; the God of vengeance, in brief the God of the orthodox church is the God, I believe, of this questionnaire. But the average man or woman is not conspicuously orthodox; lip service is what they give to the regular, ancient, orthodox God; they answered "Yes" with their own much more liberal God in mind. Does the *World* interpret their opinions correctly? I doubt it. The *World* implied from time to time that the first of its dozen questions referred to the modernist God, but in its final conclusions the fundamentalist God gets the credit. I do not like the word-juggling the *World* all too often and too eagerly executes. For instance, this sentence: "The *World's* census seems to put the burden of proof upon those who are fond of saying New York is a Godless city." I venture to repeat the challenge: "Which God?" Further, the census does not *seem* to put the burden of proof upon the liberals at all; the census for all practical purposes is an utter fraud—it demonstrates nothing except the *World's* skill with words. New York is certainly a Godless city in the fundamentalist sense of the word; we have the evidence provided by the fundamentalists themselves. New York, as the *World* ought to know, is the most liberal city in the country; there is less superstition in New York than this census or any similar device could ever show.

It is to be noted, also, that although the *World* has a circulation of several hundred thousand copies daily, representing a million or more copies of the questionnaire distributed, only ten thousand readers took the census seriously enough to "vote." I venture to believe that there were thousands of men and women who cared so little about the whole matter as to be willing to ignore it utterly. These people are, generally speaking, those who care nothing whatever about religion, never attend church, are in effect agnostics. Their position and their negative influence trouble the *World* not at all. But they exist, and they are numerous. The empty and half empty temples of the city furnish all the evidence needed in support of my contention.

A century ago no such census would ever have been possible; no newspaper would ever have thought of asking people what they believed. The fact that the *World* did conduct this inquiry is significant in that it implies that disbelief is a growing social phenomenon. People are increasingly free from theological control; they are getting through with dogma. Conditions today trace back to many causes: the growth of popular education, the collapse of the churches before the challenge of industrialism, imperialism and war, the wavering attitude of the churches on marriage, divorce, woman suffrage, etc. If we would know the real mind of the people, let us ask: Do you believe in education? Do you believe in freedom? Do you believe in happiness? The church as an institution has so often returned a negative answer to each of these vital questions that the time has come, as it was bound to come, when, despite the well-intentioned efforts of the *World,* people no longer care about religion in the old and orthodox sense of the word.

JAMES WALDO FAWCETT.

II

My friend Charles Stelzle is a corking advertising man. He has set out to advertise religion. He will make good. I am not sure that the sort of religion which needs advertising is worth advertising. But that is beside the present point. He will make good.

Even he has to find out what is to be advertised. He must know what is the religion of the American people. So, with the advice and help of "over one hundred of the leading clergymen of America," he prepared a list of twelve questions which have been circulated by one hundred and fifty of the leading newspapers in as many parts of the country.

Each reader was asked to reply "Yes" or "No" to each of the questions. The blanks were so prepared that no other replies were permissible. Doubtless no elaboration was countenanced.

At Mr. Stelzle's request I tried to get a number of persons to reply. Many upon reading the questions flatly declined. Others wrote their categorical answers under some grumbling protest, or in a jocular mood.

One, on declining, exclaimed, "The questions are stupid!" Others said exactly the same thing, though they set down their answers in the desire to be accommodating. I cannot myself withhold the conviction that these persons are right: the questions are stupid.

An experienced newspaper man once told me that all of his craft had ever to keep in mind that newspapers are aimed at a sixth-grade intelligence. Considering that the majority of newspaper readers are adults, those readers' I. Q. runs pretty low. But these questions on religious belief are being exploited by newspapers. They were perhaps prepared to match the capacity of the readers of newspapers. Aimed at an adult intelligence normal to a child of the sixth grade in the schools, they must inevitably approach the border line of stupidity, if they do not pass over.

But this is libeling the child in the sixth grade. These questions are not stupid because they are simple. They are banally vague. The answers can not mean anything worth recording. In the case of several questions two persons, whose actual beliefs are as near

identical as theological beliefs can ever become, might answer to the very opposite effect.

Thus, the first question is "Do you believe in God?" The name is treated in such a question as though deity were a familiar and definitive entity of objective knowledge. As a matter of fact no two persons conceive the same entity when they apply the name. There is some sense in asking if one believes in *a* God, though even that leaves the question so vague as to make the reply of little consequence.

If one is asked whether he knows Jeremiah Q. Simpkins, one's Yes or No comes naturally, and has some meaning. The reference is manifestly to an individual capable of being identified as himself and not anybody else. If one is asked whether he knows *a* man, one's reply comes not less promptly, though one may wonder what is the point of such a question. But if one were asked whether one knows or believes in man, one would be limited to looking stupid, for neither one's Yes nor No could escape a degree of stupidity.

Multitudes are now, to be sure, denying the existence of God. We are even being regaled with the propaganda of atheist societies. Many inside as well as outside of the churches more or less outspokenly repudiate belief in those definitions of deity which have passed current in generally accepted creeds. There is much denial of personality in deity. There is some denial that any existence or object justifies even the name. But these sweeping denials, like the sweeping affirmations, mean nothing.

There can be no significance in any replies of the rank and file of citizens who answer "Yes" or "No" to the vague questions submitted in this questionnaire. Later on we shall be flooded with all sorts of generalizations based upon the returns. Slavish devotees of old creeds will indulge in exultant acclaim of the sound faith of the American rank and file, if the returns are largely affirmative. They will vent correspondingly lugubrious Jeremiads if a considerable number shall vote in the negative. And neither their exultant nor their doleful outcries will have any real significance except to themselves—and they themselves will be deceived.

It will not be at all possible from the returns to arrive at the knowledge which is of real interest to thoughtful people. To what extent is a belief in a personal supernatural deity, willingly controlling the material and spiritual experiences of men, entertained by the American people of today? How does such a being stand related to the universe? Immanent or transcendent? A part, or the whole, or no immediate part at all? Do traditional creeds grip? That is after all the practical question. Is official religion hitting the point in the preaching of its pulpits or the formulas of its creeds or the rubrics of its ritual?

The fact is that profound changes are going on in the religious thinking of the American people. Rate their I. Q. at any figure which the most meticulous intelligence tests may indicate. With what intelligence they have they are thinking. And their thinking is of vital concern to our religious institutions.

This test is likely only more to confuse and obscure the issue which religious leaders ought to want to make clear and indubitable. No matter how large a majority will say "Yes, I believe in God," and "Yes, I believe in immortality," it still behooves every preacher or other interpreter of the traditional creeds of the churches to take careful note of the submergence of such doctrines in beliefs which the rank and file conceive to be of much more fundamental and practical significance to the mind and soul and daily practice of the common man of today.

But Stelzle will make good, of course. Religion, or something which goes by the name, will get talked about. The advertising success will be marked, and may be roaring. We may even conceive that we have become more virtuous by indulging in a degree of pious garrulity. Thinking is all to the good. Vague thinking is better than none at all. None may disallow even stupid thinking about so immemorially important, and so vitally practical a theme as religion, if no other kind is practicable. The people will profit by the exercise, even though "the leading clergymen of America" remain unenlightened by the returns, or grow more bewildered than they are now.

JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE.

Jottings

The National Council for the Prevention of War is saying some straight things about our dispute with Mexico. It calls Secretary Kellogg's last note to the Mexican government "a lawyer's brief for certain U. S. oil interests." It declares that "neither blundering diplomacy nor atrocity tales can justify unfriendly action on a legal issue." Amen!

Arthur Ponsonby, distinguished English pacifist, is now in this country. His book, "Now Is the Time" should be read by everybody. Here is the slogan of his message and his cause—

There is no international dispute that can not be solved in the council chamber. There is no international dispute that can be solved by war.

It is interesting to notice how excited the Washington Republicans are getting over Samuel Hopkins Adams's book, "Revelry," with its remorseless revelation of Harding and his Ohio Gang. This is sacrilege, cry these Republicans; think of treating living persons in a novel in this scandalous fashion! Yet, O yet—we remember that the *Saturday Evening Post* published a piece of fiction early in the war, entitled "The Thunder of Silence," which lampooned Senator La-

Follette, and all the Republicans were delighted. Didn't somebody say something once about a gored bull?

The Christmas season, just closed, was signalized by the inauguration of a movement to discourage the use of the abbrevation, "Xmas." The movement speaks of the irreverence of this abbreviation. We see no irreverence, but we most certainly do see carelessness, inaccuracy, and bad taste. We therefore hope the movement may in time succeed.

In a letter, just published, which was written by Professor George Herbert Palmer to the late President Eliot in 1894, the former speaks of "the hearty friendship, I might say the love, which makes it a delight to *work with you either in opposition or alliance.*" Study those italicized words, friends! When we have reached the point where we can work *with* a person, either in *opposition* or *alliance,*" we have solved the problem of tolerance, mastered the discipline of love, entered into the secret of life.

Dr. Richmond, of Union College, says of intercollegiate football that it is "nearly a national scandal." In proof of his assertion he states that "one Eastern university alone had gate receipts from football of almost $800,000 this fall." Dr. Richmond proves his case. But what is he going to do about it? Why talk only, and not act?

J. H. H.

American Notes

[Editorial Correspondence]

I

The holiday season, through which we have just been passing, turned men's minds back to thoughts of joy. Then, if ever, heaven comes to earth! How is it with America? America, probably, was never better fed and clothed than today. And, human life was never freer nor better protected than today, in this land of banditry and lynching. This is not to apologize for these crimes. But, one should be duly grateful for his benefits. A personal illustration will be in place. On the 20th of the month, my daughter, in Moscow, and I, in America, will start on a 1,000 mile trip. On Christmas Day, she will be taking dinner with my son, in Dresden, while I shall be taking dinner with another daughter, in California. After Christmas, she will take her way across the Atlantic for New York while I shall go on my way to Mexico City. On the 30th of January, or before, we expect to meet in Chicago. This is none the less wonderful, although occurring to many people, with variations. It reveals that we are living in a world in which human life is comparatively safe and free. Our freedom and security, as compared with a couple of centuries ago, are really remarkable.

Here is another incident revealing that joy is working in many ways. Only this morning, as I was walking to my breakfast—it was before 7 o'clock and still quite dark—I met three boys standing next to the telephone-post, waiting for the car. Like the traveller in "Pilgrim Progress," I drew near and entered into conversation. On asking, where they were going, I was startled by the reply, "We're going down to the *Star.*" For the moment, I rubbed my eyes, and then recovering I recalled that our city has a daily paper. The *Star*. Of course, for the moment, I was thinking of the three wise men of the east, who were out to find the Star. I didn't however reveal my thoughts to the three boys, carrying the wisdom of fourteen years! But here's the story of these boys, I met in the dark, under the telephone, waiting for the car to take them to the *Star*. They had each secured twelve new subscribers to the *Star*, for one month, and turned in 12 dollars. Everyone doing this was promised a trip into the mountains—just like the 15-dollar trip on the auto buses. Everything—eats, sticks, skis, etc.—was included. The joy on the faces of the boys I met this morning seeking the *Star* was hardly less than the joy on the faces of the wise men, seeking the Star of Bethlehem. I am religious enough to believe that the Bethlehem Star incident had considerable to do with the three boys' morning journey to the daily *Star*.

II

At this season of the year, an enterprising newspaper syndicate is for one whole week printing a religious questionnaire. Every morning, some millions of readers will be faced with the questions—not, Are you prepared to meet your God?—but, Do you believe in God? Do you believe in immortality? Do you believe in prayer as a means of personal relationship with God? Do you believe that the Bible is inspired in a sense that no other literature could be said to be inspired? Do you regularly have "family worship" in your home? Do you send your children to any school of religious instruction? These questions are sandwiched in between, "Meet Me at Rogers" and "Milk Prices Advance." They are one of the signs of the times, showing a commercial attempt to interpret or influence religion. It is a quiet assumption that religion is a thing that can be advertised and sold. In fact, the "ad" men are now inviting in the preachers—getting a rabbi, a priest, a pastor to sit at the same banqueting table, their pictures to appear in public print together and telling how they can increase their congregations, by "judicious advertising." The bill-board men are doing likewise. This is really deeper than at first might seem. Even the Fundamentalists are taken in by the lure of publicity. They are delighted, like the "worldly Modernists" in seeing their pictures in the papers, and in big "ads." My morning paper, for example, has 16 square inches of "ad" announcing the FIRST FUNDAMENTALIST BAPTIST CHURCH as being born tomorrow. The first sermon of this new sect, split, will be on "The New Old-fashioned Baby." Such an "ad" is naturally flanked by a half-column write-up, with picture of the pastor and his declaration to stand on the "true foundation." The

"ad" carries the information that The First Fundamentalist Baptist Church stands "for the Pure Gospel from a Whole Bible to a lost world whose only salvation is in the shed blood of the Lord Jesus Christ, who died on Calvary in our stead; who is now our Advocate before our Father in Heaven, and who is coming again to receive us unto Himself. If you believe in God's Word, from Gen. 1:1 to Rev. 22:21, 'Come with us, and we will do thee good.'" The effect of this kind of advertising is certain to have a profound effect upon religion. It will tend to encourage horn-blowing in public-places.

But along with this is appearing such movements as the effort of the Grace Church of Denver to make a Reading Church, to feed the minds of the people with the best literature. This springs from the same motive that led Bishop Vincent to found what has proved to be the vast Chautauqua Educational movement, a desire to carry the best knowledge to the common people. Grace Church is trying to make her people intelligent through the excellent pamphlets and cheap classics and bulletins—labor and social—that are multiplying rapidly in American life. Among the pamphlets are those issued by the League for Industrial Democracy—70 Fifth Avenue—and Kirby Page's series—347 Madison Avenue, N. Y. City—which cover the social, religious and industrial fields. One of the best and latest of Page's series is "The Philippines and the United States"—being an abridgement of Moorfield Storey's fine book on the same subject. Recently there has been born "The Vanguard Press," which is issuing works of the great writers, such classics as Tolstoy's "War-Patriotism—Peace," Veblen's "Theory of the Leisure Class," Morris's "News from Nowhere"—and the like. Members of Grace Church are urged to subscribe for *Labor Letter*, a weekly bulletin of information in the world of industry. And next, a circulating library for members! This is the dream of the pastor, Rev. A. A. Heiss. It would not be surprising if the cry for a Reading Church should generate a "movement," that would cover the whole land.

III

America enters the new year with Captain Coolidge on the bridge. He has posted up on the Bulletin-Board where the passengers may read, as they pass, words of courage, to the nation in its unparalled prosperity. Give credits to the taxpayers to the amount of $38,000,000. Protect the home industries by tariff. Stimulate farmer's co-operative societies. Develop the rivers of the land. Regulate the radio through the commerce department. Forestall a possible coal strike, by naming a board to distribute coal and stop profiteering, if a strike comes. Pass an effective anti-lynching bill. Encourage rubber production in the Philippines, while not impeding the desire of the Filipinos for ultimate independence. Strengthen the Prohibition laws wherever necessary to make them more effective. So the American Ship of State sails into 1927! And today comes the announcement that on January 1st wages in San Francisco go up one dollar a day. It seems that San Francisco has an "Impartial Wage Board" consisting of M. C. Sloss, Bishop Hanna and Selah Chamberlain. The industrialists will back up the decision of the board. The trade unions do not recognize the "Impartial Wage Board" but naturally they will not oppose a raise in wages. The unions insist that they can not stop until they secure the right of collective bargaining.

SYDNEY STRONG.

The Story of My Experiments with Truth

[The Autobiography of Mahatma Gandhi]

(Copyrighted, 1926)

PART II—CHAPTER XVI

Man Proposes, God Disposes

The case having been concluded, I had no reason for staying in Pretoria. So I went back to Durban, and began to make preparations for my return home. But Abdulla Seth was not the man to let me sail without a send-off. He gave a farewell party in my honor at Sydenham.

It was proposed to spend the whole day there. Whilst I was turning over the sheets of some of the newspapers I found there, I chanced to see a paragraph in a corner of one of them under the heading, "Indian Franchise." It was with reference to the Bill then before the House of Legislature which sought to deprive the Indians of their right to elect members of the Natal Legislative Assembly. I was ignorant of the Bill, and so were the rest of the guests who had assembled there.

I inquired of Abdulla Seth about it. He said: "What can we understand in these matters? We can only understand things that affect our trade. As you know, all our trade in the Orange Free State has been swept away. We agitated about it but to no avail. We are after all lame men, being unlettered. We take in newspapers generally only to ascertain the daily market rates, etc. What can we know of legislation? Our eyes and ears are the European attorneys here."

"But," said I, "there are so many young Indians born and educated here. Do not they help you?"

"They!" exclaimed Abdulla Seth in despair, "they never care to come to us, and, to tell you the truth, we care less to recognize them. Being Christians they are under the thumb of the white clergymen, who in their turn are subject to the Government."

This opened my eyes. I felt that this class should be claimed as our own. Was this the meaning of Christianity? Did they cease to be Indians because they were Christians?

But I was on the point of returning home and hesitated to express what was passing through my mind in this matter. I simply said to Abdulla Seth: "This Bill, if it passes into law, will make your lot extremely difficult. It is the first nail in our coffin. It strikes at the root of our self-respect."

"It may," echoed Seth Abdulla, "but I will tell you the genesis of the Franchise question. We knew nothing about it. But Mr. Escombe, one of our best attorneys, whom you know, put the idea into our heads. It happened thus. He is a great fighter and there

being no love lost between him and the Wharf Engineer, he feared that the Engineer might deprive him of his votes and defeat him at the election. So he acquainted us with our condition, and at his instance we all registered ourselves as voters, and voted for him at the election. You will now see how the franchise has not for us the value that you attach to it. But we understand what you say. Well, then what is your advice?"

The other guests were listening to this conversation with attention. One of them said: "Shall I tell you what should be done? You cancel your passage by this boat, stay here a month longer and we will fight as you direct us."

All the others chimed in: "Indeed, indeed, Abdulla Seth, you must detain Gandhibhai."

The Seth was a shrewd man. He said "I may not detain him now. Or rather, you have as much right as I to do so. But what you say is quite true. Let us *all* persuade him to stay on. But you should remember that he is a barrister. What about his fees?"

The mention of fees pained me and I broke in: "Abdulla Seth, fees are out of the question. There can be no fees for public work. I can stay, if at all, as a servant. And as you know, I am not acquainted with all these friends. But if you believe that they will cooperate, I am prepared to stay a month longer. There is one thing, however. Though you need not pay me anything, work of the nature we contemplate cannot be done without some funds to start with. Thus we may have to send telegrams; we may have to print some literature; some touring may have to be done; the local attorneys may have to be consulted; and as I am ignorant of your laws I may need some law-books for reference. All this cannot be done without money. And it is clear that one man is not enough for this work. Many must come forward to help him."

And a chorus of voices was heard: "Allah is great and merciful. Money will come in. Men there are, as many as you may need. You please consent to stay, and all will be well."

The farewell party was thus turned into a working committee. I suggested finishing dinner, etc., quickly and getting back home. I worked out in my own mind an outline of the campaign. I ascertained the names of those who were on the list of voters, and made up my mind to stay on for a month.

Thus God laid the foundations of my life in South Africa and sowed the seed of the fight for national self-respect.

M. K. GANDHI.

(*Translated from Navajivan by Mahadeo Desai.*)

The Outlawry of War

[On December 23rd last, the *Christian Century* printed a remarkable special issue celebrating Senator Borah's Resolution for the Outlawry of War as the program of world peace today. We are indebted to the editors of the *Christian Century* for the following articles which appeared among many others in this issue. The first article, by Mr. S. O. Levinson, was written in answer to a request for a specimen universal treaty such as might embody the purpose of Senator Borah's Resolution.—Editor.]

I

A Treaty to Outlaw War

I am submitting a form of general treaty in compliance with your request. I do not attempt therein to anticipate the numerous suggestions of additional provisions which might have been incorporated. But if this brief draft of a treaty succeeds in summarizing the indispensable elements in the basis of peace, distilled from the Borah resolution, the further details of development and structure, whose vast importance I freely admit, should be wisely left to a world convention called for that purpose. With considerable diffidence I offer the following:

DRAFT TREATY TO OUTLAW WAR

We the undersigned nations of the world hereby condemn and abandon forever the use of war as an instrument for the settlement of international disputes and for the enforcement of decisions and awards of international tribunals, and hereby outlaw the immemorial institution of war by making its use a public crime as the fundamental law of nations. Subtle and fatal distinctions between permissible and nonpermissible kinds of war are blotted out; the institution of war is thus outlawed, as the institution of dueling has been outlawed; but the question of genuine self-defense, with nations as with individuals, is not involved or affected by this treaty. In order to provide a complete and pacific substitute for the arbitrament of war, we hereby agree to take immediate action for the equipment of an international court of justice with a code of the laws of peace, based upon equality and justice between all nations. With war outlawed and the code approved and ratified, the court shall be given jurisdiction over all purely international disputes as defined and enumerated in the code or arising under treaties, with power to summon in a defendant nation at the petition of a complaining nation and to hear and decide the matters in controversy. We hereby agree to abide by and in full good faith to carry out the decisions of such international tribunal. The judicial system thus established, being a complete substitute for the outworn and destructive war system, will enable the nations to adopt far-reaching and economically vital programs of disarmament.

(*Signatures of the Nations.*)

This treaty proposes a simple, direct and uncompromisable attack on the traditional institution of war. It proposes to the nations for the first time in human history to cut the roots of war's legal and institutional status, as the only way to destroy this untamed monster of civilization.

The gist of the treaty is that it turns the full power of international law against the war system. The principle underlying the outlawry of war is this: *The law should always be on the moral side of every question.* But the law of nations has always been on the wrong side of the war issue. International law has continued to recognize, shelter, potect and reenforce the legal status of war until war has become the most lawful thing in civilization. For, what with laws of

conscription, martial laws and espionage acts, every one who impedes in the slightest degree the operations of war is a criminal.

The dire effect of our present situation is plainly seen, for example, on our ministers of religon. They are all morally against war, but because it is legal multitudes of ministers find no way to oppose it Thus we have the sad spectacle of the conflict between morality and law as shown on the international canvas. The law which should condemn and stigmatize evil, actually embraces and nurtures it, and thereby thwarts the moral will of civilization.

Being unspeakably evil, war's moral status cannot be changed, but its legal status can be and must be changed.

International law has wholly failed to be on the moral side of the war question. Not until the will of mankind throws the irresistible weight of the majesty of the law on the moral side, by destroying war's institutional status, by condemning and outlawing it, will this plague of plagues, which has baffled and shamed religion and civilization, ever be exterminated.

No halting, feeble, half-way measures will serve; no resolutions or protocols prohibiting the use of certain weapons of war can rise above the folly of self-deception; war cannot be regulated or controlled, for it makes its own ruthless laws which respect neither God nor man; therefore war must not be compromised with, but its entire system, with its warp of force and its woof of death, must be uprooted, overthrown, outlawed—abolished. *S. O. Levinson.*

II

The Simplicity of Outlawry

Thomas Huxley tells us that, when Darwin's "Origin of Species" appeared, he was astonished at the simplicity of the idea which was therein presented. "In 1857," he says, "I had no answer [to the question of evolution], and I do not think that any one else had. A year later, we reproached ourselves with dullness for being perplexed. . . . My reflection when I first made myself master of the central idea of the 'Origin' was, 'How extremely stupid not to have thought of that!'"

I imagine that this is the feeling of us all when we first encounter a creative idea, a suggestion that cuts to the core of a tangled problem. It certainly was my feeling when the concept of outlawry as applied to war, first swept through my mind. This concept came, as Huxley says that Darwin's doctrine came to the minds of his generation, as a "flash of light, which to a man who has lost himself in a dark night, suddenly reveals a road which, whether it takes him straight home or not, certainly goes his way."

Here for centuries men had recognized the evil of war and tried to get rid of it. Beginning with Hugo Grotius, they had put it strictly under the control of law, to the end of defining its functions, limiting its area, mitigating or repressing altogether its horrors. They had decreed that war must be fought in a certain way—with due respect for treaties, with due protection for neutrals and non-combatants, with weapons not too destructive or barbarous in their operation. It could be declared only after diplomatic negotiations had failed, and in settlement only of certain decisive issues involving territorial integrity or national honor. A great mass of law, comprising the larger part of so-called international law, had grown up as constituting the *leges belli,* or code of war.

This business of fighting between the nations, in other words, had become as precise, polite and punctilious as the *code duello.* A nation had to be scrupulously careful in the use of arms to see that it did not violate the accepted conventions, and thus fall under the condemnation of the conscience of mankind. But meanwhile war remained the apparently inevitable, the indubitably glorious thing it had always been. And under this careful legal guardianship, it flourished more terribly than ever! Wars multiplied in number, widened in area, used ever more destructive weapons of attack. At last, in the world war, the system of control exploded, so to speak, and carried us back, in one black night of horror, to those days of chaos and savagery from which society thought it had been rescued forever.

Immediately at the close of this conflict, men set themselves once again to the old task of putting war in bonds, this time in bonds that would not break. So new regulations were forged (the League of Nations), new alternative devices set up (the World Court), new restrictions laid upon arms and military operations (the Washington treaties). But what chance was there that these would hold? Had not war become a vaster thing than men could handle? Were not the militarists right, perhaps, in saying that there was nothing to do but to prepare for the inevitable? Was there any hope for peace save that desperate hope in "education," which Mr. Wells, for example, offered as the only contender in the race with "catastrophe"? Out of this despair, or fear, has sprung the disillusionment so characteristic of our time. For where is the assurance that what men have failed to do in the past, they can suddenly do now, by education or any other means, in the infinitely more complex and difficult conditions of the present day?

It was under the stress of this disillusionment when there seemed to be no answer to the dilemma of war, as there was no answer in 1857 to the biological dilemma of the origin of species, that Mr. S. O. Levinson came along with his idea of outlawry. The simplicity of his idea, as of every great idea, is startling, and also humiliating; it is so obvious!

There is no ending of war, says Mr. Levinson, in this method of regulation which we have been following these many centuries, and are still following today. No laws of war, however numerous and severe, will ever destroy war which is itself recognized, protected and sanctified by the very existence of these laws. Nothing that man has ever done through his international law has ever shaken the position of war as the established method of settling disputes between nations. On the contrary, everything that man has done through his international law has only tended to strengthen this position of war as the recognized and established arbiter of national destinies. We have taken war over into our social system; we have interwoven it into the pattern of our international life; we have legalized it, and thus institutionalized it. We have made it, in other words, the accepted way of doing a certain thing.

No! We must "right about face"! We must do what has never been done, or even suggested, before —namely, make a frontal attack upon war by banning it altogether as a recognized social process. From the status of an institution it must be changed into the status of a crime. It must be abolished by a solemn agreement, in terms of a universal treaty between states, that war is a legal as well as a moral offense

against mankind, and therefore an act forbidden by the law of nations. War, in other words, must be outlawed—not certain of its methods, not the worst of its weapons, not the cruelest of its barbarities, but the thing itself, *war!* This means that a new international law must be written—a law or code in which war shall not be defined, regulated and restricted and thereby incidentally established and protected, but shall be denounced, outlawed, and thereby banished as the worst of crimes from all human relations. This means, also, that in place of war, as a method of settling disputes between states, shall be established a world court of inherent and affirmative jurisdiction by which disputes shall be heard and decided peaceably. The method of force, in other words, shall be ended between nations as it has long since been ended between individuals, and *by the same procedure,* namely, by abolishing war (the duel) as a crime, and then annulling the laws of war (the *code duello*) and establishing in their place a new law which shall be at once a social procedure and moral sanction of peace.

Here is a new idea, and with it a new age! This idea is not, as some people imagine, a mad endeavor to accomplish at one fell swoop, so to speak, what men have hitherto been trying to achieve slowly by the step-by-step method of advance. It is a fresh beginning, a deliberate heading in a new direction, a reversal or overturn of the whole philosophy and statesmanship of pacifist reform. Neither is this idea, as has been charged, some fantastic vagary, untested by experience. On the contrary, it is an almost painfully obvious application to the war problem of precisely the same device which ended infanticide, chattel slavery, piracy, duelling, and the saloon. What the conscience had condemned as a wrong, the law outlawed, and therewith ended, as a crime. Nor is it to be supposed that this idea is some kind of dramatic gesture which is expected to end war as by the waving of a wand. It is no more such a gesture than the laws against murder, burglary, forgery, and incest. On the contrary, it is an example on a vast scale of the simple social practise of enacting law as the judgment and weapon of the community against an evil which must be destroyed because it cannot be tolerated.

What outlawy does is to give us the conditions under which war can at last be fought successfully. The trouble up to the present time has been that the pacifist has never had a chance to accomplish his end because he was fighting against the established law of nations, whereas the militarist has had every chance because he was fighting with this law upon his side. The peace-maker has never been able to be anything other than a futile agitator and on occasion a traitor, because he was the assailant of the established international order, whereas the war-maker has always been the patriot and hero because he was the defender of this order. All the law of the world in 1914 was on the side of the kaisers and the czars and the Poincarès and the Churchills, and against the Rollands and the Morleys and the Woodrow Wilsons. Now reverse these relations! Put the law of nations on the side of the peace-maker and not the war-maker, cast the militarist in prison for urging war instead of the pacifist for opposing war, and things will verily begin to change. Here is the true magic of outlawry—it establishes by law a world ordered in terms of peace, and thus friendly and not hostile to the works of peace.

It is hard to imagine, as Mr. Levinson says, "how any normal human being can do otherwise than give his approval to the proposal to rid the world of war by *casting it out of the legal system of mankind.*" Ages hence our children's children will look back in amazement that this idea was so slow in coming, and met with opposition or indifference when first proposed. I am not at all sure that this year 1926 will not come in the future to hold that epochal place in the history of international peace, which the year 1857 has come to hold in the history of natural science.

John Haynes Holmes.

III

Suppose America Should Lead!

What a thrill would go through the world if the United States should suddenly throw off all timidity, all self-complacency, all talk of America first or safety first, all this talk about safe-guarding her own rights, and become, as once she was, the prophetic nation, afraid of no venture that has in it the promise of universal brotherhood and peace! How the world would thrill if America would say: We want a world court to which every dispute must be taken and every nation be bound by its decision; we want a democratic society of nations with an elected council which has for its chief purpose the welfare of all peoples; but basic to this, and far above all this, we believe the time has come when the institution of war and a real civilization can no longer exist in the same world, and we propose that it be abolished once and for all; therefore we call upon all the nations of the world through a conference of governments which we stand ready to call, by common agreement to make war between nations a crime forever, and to this we pledge all our resources of faith and determined purpose. What a thrill would go through the world! But more, is there not a probability that if America said this with finality of conviction in her voice the whole world—the people at least—would respond with joy, seeing at last the day of their deliverance.

And now the almost unbelievable news comes that at last this country is to be called upon to make perhaps the greatest venture any nation ever made in all history.

Senator Borah has introduced into the United States senate a resolution calling upon the senate to say to the world that war between nations should be outlawed as an institution or a means for the settlement of international controversies, by making it a public crime under the law of nations, and that, with war outlawed, a judicial substitute for war should be created in the form of an international court clothed with a code of international law and possessing affirmative jurisdiction over all questions.

Again, what a thrill would go through the heart of all peoples if the senate would pass this resolution and the nation issue the call to all governments challenging them to rise to so majestic a position. Again we say we believe the peoples of the world would rise to it and we believe the governments would have to heed it. And what will happen to our President if he issues such a call? He will go down into history with Washington who made a nation; with Lincoln who made a real democracy.

And where now are the churches going to stand? Can they recover the lost power of venture? The creation of the church was a great venture. It was an act of sublime and unparalleled faith. It was because it dared the impossible that it won the early world. It was a great venture, and the world leaped to it. Has

the American church now the courage to recapture this fine faith and say to the senate of the United States and to the President: "You must do this Christian thing. War and Jesus Christ have no part together. They do not belong in the same world, and no real civilization can contain both. We have faltered and compromised long enough. The time has come to rid the world of the whole unholy war system forever. As for us, we will never again have anything to do with it. If you will dare this great venture we will stand unitedly behind you. We believe it is of God!"

Frederick Lynch,

IV

Are We in Earnest?

I am eager to test anew America's conviction on the question of war, for I believe that America's attitude toward war has not found true expression in recent elections. The league of nations problem has been confused by the willful or witless bedevilment of every manner of reason, prejudice and partisanship. American citizens have not since the war directly faced the question: "Were we in earnest when we went into the war to end war?" Hair splitting, much of it dishonest, about the forms of international association has choked the spirit of the nation which would war against war.

Senator Borah's proposal to outlaw war comes as a glorious opportunity and as a rallying cry at one and the same time. It is an immediate summons to America to put all complications aside in order to face the most urgent problem in the world: How can we help to outlaw war? This does not mean the repudiation of the moral sanctions of the war against war, but rather to attempt to do what has never been done—to put the stamp of outlawry upon war and thus oppose war with all the accumulating and increasing force of the legal sanctions of the nations.

It were a fitting, even a glorious thing, if in the war upon war America, our own country, should not only prove to be the most effective aggressor, but in addition have come upon the method which is destined to make the outlawry of war the last if not the first step prior to its abolition.

Stephen S. Wise.

V

The Next Step

Human society has overthrown other powerful legal institutions that had grown to be a menace to human welfare. Piracy, the international slave trade, the code duello, the slave system, the liquor traffic—all were legal institutions, all were as old as history—all have been outlawed and their exercise made a public crime, in the progress of mankind from barbarism up to liberty and security under law. The history of civilization in the structure of social control has been the history of the invasion of the realms of force and violence by public law.

Always the successful method for the liberation of society from the effects of an outworn legal institution has been to outlaw the institution and to make its exercise a public crime. Never has the attack been upon causes. There are just as many causes for duels today as there ever were, just as many persons who would like to get human labor without paying for it, just as many thirsts for liquor as ten years ago; but there are no duels, no human slavery, and no legal saloons in the United States. Institutions that are outlawed and their operation made a public crime, die out of the life of the world. That is the verdict of history.

This is the answer to the supreme problem and menace of war in our civilization today. The war system and the war institution must be outlawed by international agreement and war must be made a crime under the law of nations. This is the first and vitalizing step in an effective "war against war."

Raymond Robins.

The Study Table

Religious Dramas

The Century Company, in cooperation with the Federal Council of Churches, is doing an interesting piece of work in publishing a series of volumes devoted to original work in the field of religious drama. The first volume, which appeared two years ago, had a warm reception, and the plays therein have been produced, we have no doubt, in many churches.

The second volume,* which has recently come to our desk, is chiefly remarkable for a play, "The Sword of the Samurai," by Tracy D. Mygatt. Set in Japan, on the eve of the passing of the Immigration Bill discriminating against the Japanese by the United States Congress, the play presents in thrilling scenes the impact of this legislation upon the Japanese on the one hand and upon the American Christian missionaries in Japan on the other. The protagonists are a young Japanese aviator, deeply moved to the acceptance of Christianity and finding conflict with his military ambitions, an American missionary and her fiancé, an American medical missionary, who represent the Christion religion as over against the Christian civilization which betrays and shames it, and an aged Japanese grandfather, who embodies the Samurai tradition of the Mikado's empire. In tense personal drama, developed against the background of world events, there is clearly and beautifully outlined that true gospel of love and forgiveness which is Christianity as professed and so seldom practiced, especially by governments. "The Sword of the Samurai" is essentially a pacifist drama, and shows how central is this spirit and ideal to the faith of Christ. The conflict between the sword of steel and the "sword of the spirit," the heart of the drama as a whole, is focused poignantly upon the mind of the young Japanese aviator. It is the old dilemma—Christ or Caesar. Miss Mygatt is a dramatist of exceptional power, whose work challenges professional production.

The first play in the volume, "The Quest Divine," presents the novel and stirring picture of the three great prophets, Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah, brought together in a single scene. It is appropriately written in blank verse. It has dignity, beauty, power, but falls short, perhaps inevitably, of its high theme.

Eight other plays, most of them brief, complete the volume. Each play may be obtained in a separate edition.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

*"Religious Dramas," Selected by the Committee on Drama of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ of America. Published by the Century Company.

Correspondence

In Reply to Mr. Dole

Editor of UNITY: The noble individuals are not all outside of the Socialist movement, as Mr. Dole, in his article on Limitations of Socialism, implies. Yet Socialists do use unnecessarily bitter language sometimes, as he charges. In this they are not entirely exceptional. He uses a bit of strong language himself. Jesus Christ occasionally gave way to righteous wrath. All of which does not excuse us Socialists. More is expected of us than anybody else, and it is our duty to live up to the expectation. Nobody expected the Church to be true to Christ during the war, and it was not, but everybody expected the Socialists to be true to Christ, and they were, at least in America. A good way for Mr. Dole to sweeten the Socialist movement would be to get into it and set a good example. In the meanwhile we thank him for his advice and hope some of us will profit by it.

He has faith that the capitalists may prefer to do good rather than evil. They may—but almost invariably they want to do only such good as will leave them in full possession of their immoral power to get something for nothing. All such things as improved sanitary conditions in the factories, installation of safety devices, workmen's compensation, shorter hours of labor and higher wages have been wrung from them very much against their will. Wherever the law permits they ruin children in the industries. They try to blacken the reputations of those who seek social progress. Unfortunately these are hard facts, much as I wish they were not. Nevertheless, I should like to see moral suasion tried on a larger scale. I have often thought of it, and Mr. Dole's article arouses my interest afresh. I suggest that Mr. Dole father a movement whose object shall be to send delegations direct to the big capitalists and persuade them to turn their industries over to the public, by appealing to their higher natures.

As for Socialism itself, Mr. Dole has evidently misconceived it. Socialism does not come to increase standardization, which is all too nearly universal now. In some industries standardization cannot be abolished, because machine production is monotonous by nature, but the hours can be shortened, the surroundings can be made beautiful and healthful, and the dullness can be considerably relieved by giving each worker a genuine stake in the industry. Under a cooperative commonwealth the hours spent in earning a living will be few, and the rest of the time will be spent in living. During the latter and chief portion of each person's existence there will be no standardization, but there will be the fullest opportunity for the development of each individual according to his inclinations. If the human race is neither to stand still nor to go downward, but is to grow upward, it simply cannot land anywhere else than in a state of mutual love and cooperation—and that is merely another way of saying Socialism. We are on the way toward that condition. Each social advance is a step toward it. Already we have traveled quite a distance away from one hundred per cent capitalism and toward Socialism. We are not half way there yet. Once one hundred per cent Socialism is reached, the human race will be freed from slavery to economic problems and the gates to the upper regions will be open wide. The material benefits of Socialism are only incidental and causal. They clear the way. The larger objects are mental, moral, and spiritual. In my opinion, the great ultimate object is wholly and exclusively spiritual.

JOHN M. WORK.

Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

United States and Belgium

Editor of UNITY:

In issue of the 15th inst. I note that a correspondent, Myron F. Foster, in a letter makes a charge against the honor of the United States when he states that, "England, France, Germany and the United States signed a treaty with Belgium guaranteeing Belgium neutrality and Belgium on her part agreed to resist all attempts to violate it." He also adds, "England made a late start to rescue Belgium and the United States shirked her duty in fulfilling her obligation until for other reasons than Belgium neutrality we finally got into the world war."

The assumption is that your correspondent attempts to refer to the Treaty of 1839. I wonder if he can tell or give his assumed authority for his charge that the United States participated in a Treaty guaranteeing the neutrality of Belgium and "shirked her duty in fulfilling her obligations?"

We want facts. We do not want simply reference to the war propaganda of 1914-1917.

WM. C. ALLEN.

San Jose, California.

[*Mr. Foster was of course mistaken in his assertion. The United States had no part in the Treaty of 1839, and was, therefore under no obligation to defend Belgium. Neither was England, for that matter—see Ewart's "Roots and Causes of the Wars, 1914-1918." pp. 132-40, 412-44!—Editors.*]

One Final Answer to Mr. Foster

Editor of UNITY:

The questions propounded by your militaristic correspondent, Myron F. Foster, deserve an answer, difficult as it may be to consistently meet each dilemma that he presents.

He says that we could not submit to arbitration any question pertaining to our own domestic affairs as, for instance, our right to exclude undesirable aliens. The pacifist can reply that if the demand from other countries for admission of their nationals becomes so insistent as to be a cause for war, the United States can readily submit the issue to an impartial court or commission. If the decision is adverse to our interests, which is improbable, the necessary modification of our isolation may prove of advantage to mankind. At any rate, some concession would be preferable to war.

His next embarrassing question is that of the Civil War which Lincoln supported. To criticize Lincoln is considered even beyond the insolence of a pacifist; but in view of the generations of bitterness subsequent to the internecine conflict it seems now as if Lincoln, living today and viewing the situation in retrospect, might wish to change his decision and permit the Southern States to secede until such time as they might consider it to their interest to reunite with the North. Without the Civil War slavery would have been abolished before this. The war that seemed an idealistic sacrifice sixty-five years ago now appears to be another example of unnecessary calamity.

"How about the war of the Revolution?" he asks. Well, will Mr. Foster advocate a violent revolution in any country, India for example, because of similar acts of oppression? But granting that liberty was gained by our ancestors by force of arms that could not have been wrung from King George in any other manner, we must realize that times have changed. If Great Britain still controlled our destinies she would not attempt to oppress 110,000,000 Americans any more than she does Canadians who have always remained loyal.

Mr. Foster asks if England, France, Germany and Japan would have encroached upon China if that country had possessed adequate armaments. Probably not; but what constitutes an adequate army and navy? How many countries can have a stronger military equipment than every other? China is in a better condition today than if she had attempted to be aggressively armed.

In his advocacy of preparedness Mr. Foster should remember what happened to the country better prepared, more skillful, more militaristic than any other. She was defeated. And as for Belgium, for generations her people have been taxed to maintain an army that proved totally inadequate when the time for defense arrived.

War has proved a failure. The burden of proof has been shifted to the militarist.

Arbitrarily yours,

WILLIAM FLOYD.

New York City.

Two Comments

Editor of UNITY:

In her splendid letter—A Refutation—in your issue of October 25th, Lydia G. Wentworth truly says: "Yet belief in a sham is a powerful factor for evil, since our beliefs largely rule our voluntary conduct.

Of that nature is the general belief that we exchange what is not human work.

And she asks: "Can we control ourselves?"

We can if we have enough of the right kind of knowl-

The Field

"The World is my country, to do good is my Religion."

RESOLUTION TOWARD THE OUTLAWRY OF WAR

Introduced in the United States Senate, December 9, 1926

By Senator William E. Borah

Whereas war is the greatest existing menace to society and has become so expensive and destructive that it not only causes the stupendous burdens of taxation now afflicting our people but threatens to engulf and destroy civilization; and

Whereas civilization has been marked in its upward trend out of barbarism into its present condition by the development of law and courts to supplant methods of violence and force; and

Whereas the genius of civilization has discovered but two methods of compelling the settlement of human disputes, namely, law and war, and therefore, in any plan for the compulsory settlement of international controversies, we must choose between war on the one hand and the process of law on the other; and

Whereas war between nations has always been and still is a lawful institution, so that any nation may, with or without cause, declare war against any other nation and be strictly within its legal rights; and

Whereas revolutionary war or wars of liberation are illegal and criminal; to-wit, high treason; whereas, under existing international law, wars between nations to settle disputes are perfectly lawful; and

Whereas the overwhelming moral sentiment of civilized people everywhere is against the cruel and destructive institution of war; and

Whereas all alliances, leagues, or plans which rely upon war as the ultimate power for the enforcement of peace carry the seeds either of their own destruction or military dominancy to the utter subversion of liberty and justice; and

Whereas we must recognize the fact that resolutions or treaties outlawing certain methods of killing will not be effective so long as war itself remains lawful; and that in international relations we must have, not rules and regulations of war but organic laws against war; and

Whereas in our constitutional convention of 1787 it was successfully contended by Madison, Hamilton and Ellsworth that the use of force when applied to people collectively, that is, to states or nations, in the execution of a judicial decision, is unsound in principle and would be tanamount to a declaration of war; and

Whereas we have in our federal supreme court a practical and effective model for a real international court, as it has specific jurisdiction to hear and decide controversies between our sovereign states; and

Whereas our supreme court has exercised this jurisdiction without resort to force for one hundred and thirty-seven years, during which time scores of controversies have been judicially and peaceably settled that might otherwise have led to war between the states, and thus furnishes a practical exemplar for the compulsory and pacific settlement of international controversies; and

Whereas an international arrangement of such judicial character would not shackle the independence or impair the sovereignty of any nation, and would not involve or affect the right of self-defense against invasion or attack, such right being inherent and ineradicable, but should not be a mere subterfuge for the traditional use of war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the view of the senate of the United States that war between nations should be outlawed as an institution or means for the settlement of international controversies by making it a public crime under the law of nations and that every nation should be encouraged by solemn agreement or treaty to bind itself to indict and punish its own international war breeders or instigators and war profiteers under powers similar to those conferred upon our congress under Article I, section 8, of our federal constitution which clothes the congress with the power "to define and punish offenses against the law of nations"; And be it

Resolved further, That a code of international law of peace based upon the outlawing of war and on the principle of equality and justice between all nations, amplified and expanded and adapted and brought down to date should be created and adopted.

Second. That, with war outlawed, a judicial substitute for war should be created (or, if existing in part, adapted and adjusted) in the form or nature of an international court, modeled on our federal supreme court in its jurisdiction over controversies between our sovereign states; such court shall possess affirmative jurisdiction to hear and decide all purely international controversies, as defined by the code or arising under treaties, and its judgments shall not be enforced by war under any name or in any form whatever, but shall have the same power for their enforcement as our federal supreme court, namely, the respect of all enlightened nations for judgments resting upon open and fair investigations and impartial decisions, the agreement of the nations to abide and be bound by such judgments, and the compelling power of enlightened public opinion.

ANNOUNCEMENT

Dr. Sydney Strong is available for addresses, in and around Chicago, from January 23rd to February 6th (inclusive), 1927, on:

1. "Seeing Mexico Through 30 Pairs of Eyes, in January, 1927." He is a member of the Hubert Herring Party, making co-operative observations.
2. "The Peace Letter to the President, or the New Ponsonby Method of Attack on War."
3. "The Year 1922 in Australasia,

---

edge. But, unfortunately, such knowledge in some of the most vital fields of human action has not yet come into the possession of the mass of the people.

And I note that in the third editorial in the same issue of UNITY, no distinction is made between the roadbed of a transportation system and the vehicles that go over that roadbed. Yet, a thorough understanding of the subject will show that they are not in the same class. The roadbed of a car line should be compared with the highway; but the cars themselves should be compared with the autos that go over the highway.

In order to maintain equal freedom the roadbeds in all cases should be maintained at public expense. But, the people who travel in other than their own vehicles should pay those who carry them for both the direct work of carrying them and their share of the indirect work of maintaining the vehicles.

That the various kinds of roadbeds be maintained for the free use of all is necessary to the maintenance of equal freedom. But it is not only not necessary that people be carried so, but to make it a basic practice to so carry people would interfere with equal freedom, because someone must do the work of carrying people and it is not equitable that they be compelled to do it without compensation. Nor can any sort of general levy on the riders fit, because they are not equally benefited by people being so carried.

The only equitable way is for each to directly (via checks) pay for the work actually received in being carried.

VAUGHN BACHMAN BROKAW.

Phoenix, Arizona.

From Friends Abroad

I

Editor of UNITY:

I write to thank you for UNITY, and to say how much Mrs. E. and I enjoy its meat.

L. M. ENGLAND.

Kingston, Ontario.

II

Editor of UNITY:

When I tell you that UNITY is a great source of encouragement, there is no question of handing you flowers. It is simply a genuine expression of gratitude for the existence of one stronghold of liberal and straight thinking in a world in which the forces of reaction are winning victory after victory, controlling one country after another, and bidding fair to plunge the world back into unashamed barbarism. Man is very busy demonstrating that he is capable of everything except self-control and good government. You at least are keeping the spark of liberty alight in case there should be better times ahead!

HARRISON BROWN.

Paris, France.

or a Study in Comparative Democracy."

4. "The Year 1923 in Germany with Side-trips to Russia."

Dr. Strong is an extensive traveler. Besides Australasia and Europe (several times) he has been in Japan and, on a special deputation by the American Board, in South Africa. He was for 10 years a pastor in Oak Park, Ill.

Engagements may be made through Open Forum Speakers' Bureau, 19 S. La Salle Street, Chicago. Telephone, Randolph 5558.

May I in this way say to my friends, that I am starting December 21, via California for Mexico, where I shall be a member of Hubert C. Herring's Seminar. Address, Hotel Panuco, Mexico City. Reach there Dec. 31. I hope to return via Kansas City and St. Louis, reaching Chicago, by Sunday morning, January 23, 1927—and to remain in Chicago until February 6. Address, Care Dr. John R. Nichols, 19 S. La Salle Street, Chicago.

SYDNEY STRONG,
508 Garfield St., Seattle.

KIEL UNIVERSITY ESTABLISHES CHAIR OF PEACE

Kiel University in Germany, founded two hundred and sixty years ago, has established a chair of peace "to promote peace at home and abroad." The first incumbent is Dr. Walter Schucking, a judge of the Hague Court, one of the five German delegates at Versailles, and one of the world's greatest authorities on international law. He was chairman of the German section of the Interparliamentary Union when it met in Washington a year ago.

The St. Louis *Globe-Democrat*, which, by the way, is not a pacifist publication, comments thus:

"Considering how many chairs of war have been long established and the number of tax-supported institutions devoted wholly to war's demands and how the raucous voice of the drill master is heard on the campuses of so many universities dedicated to the preparation for civilian life, may there not be an advantage in the establishment of this chair of peace? With a chair of this sort in institutions here and there, especially in countries that most profess devotion to peace, may not a branch of peace engineering be developed in time that will do more for the world than all the military engineering ever mastered?"

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

3913 Cottage Grove

Tel. Atlantic 1876

Special New Year Offer

SERMON ON THE SEA

by

Mahatma Gandhi

with an introduction by Mr. Holmes, edited by Mr. Muzumdar, Gandhi's Biographer.

Post Paid $1.35

and

UNITY

Yearly Subscription .. 3.00

Two Together 3.25

Sermon on the Sea may be had either singly or in combination from the Unity office.

700 Oakwood Boulevard
Chicago

JANUARY

Preparations for a trip south, or a continuation of Winter Social Activities at home, suggest that you save expense thru the cleansing of your garments by our new system of continuous clarification.

Schumann & Co
Cleaners Dyers

PHONE DREXEL 0261 ALL DEPARTMENTS
MAIN OFFICE AND WORKS
3960 Cottage Grove Avenue

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. and Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor —large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

For Happy Health!

Drink a glassful of Bowman's Milk. You'll like it, for Bowman's Milk is full cream milk. It is always rich and pure. In it are the elements so necessary for happy health!

Make it a habit to drink a glass of Bowman's Milk at every meal.

Insist on

BOWMAN DAIRY COMPANY MILK

Phone Oakland 489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES

Everything in HARDWARE

AT

PORTER'S

4236 Cottage Grove Ave.